



HOMAN & BADGER, Publishers.

"OUR HOME, OUR COUNTRY AND OUR BROTHER MAN."

TERMS: Two Dollars, in Advance.

Vol. XLVI.

Augusta, Maine, Saturday Morning, December 8, 1877.

No. 2.

Maine Farmer.

S. L. BARDMAN, Agricultural Editor.

Forthcoming Events.

PATRIOTS OF HUSBANDY: Maine State Grange, Annual meeting at Saco, Tuesday, Dec. 12.

HARVEST CEREMONY: Jackson, Lewiston, Saturday, Dec. 15.

PROGRESSIVE COUNTY FARMERS' CLUB: Stated meeting at Hermon Corners, Wednesday, Dec. 19th.

MAINE POULTRY ASSOCIATION: Annual exhibition at Portland, Dec. 12th-15th, 1878.

COUNTY AGRICULTURAL CONVENTION: Unity, Vassalboro, Dec. 15th-16th. A Lecture will be given by Prof. M. C. Fernald of Maine State College.

CENTRAL MAINE POULTRY ASSOCIATION: Second Annual exhibition at Fairfield, Wednesday, Thursday, Friday, Dec. 12th-14th.

F. E. McFADSEN, Secretary.

ANDROSCOGGIN POULTRY ASSOCIATION: At Lewiston, Jan. 21st-22nd, 1878.

The Cost of Growing Corn.

The report of a committee of the Penobscot County Farmers' Club to award the special premium offered by Mr. J. F. Snow of Bangor, to any member of the club for the best half acre of corn, presents some suggestive facts concerning the cost of growing that crop by the farmers in Penobscot county, which are so distinctively worth looking at carefully; because definiteness of cost comes in at last, is not a thing of every-day occurrence in farming operations.

For Mr. Snow's premium, there were the following competitors: Hebron Ladd, Bangor; T. J. Chase, Ortington; E. H. Gregory, Hayden; and Charles Copeland, Holden. The fields were visited by the committee while the crop was growing, and at the final examination the corn growing on one square rod was cut, husked and weighed, from which the yield of the half acre was severally estimated. The first premium was awarded to Charles Copeland, whose half acre yielded—according to the printed report of the committee, \$3 1/2 bushels of shelled corn; and the second to E. H. Gregory whose half acre produced 75 bushels and 25 pounds of shelled corn.

Rock-weed as a Fertilizer.

(Sea-shore Farmer.) It is not true as our correspondent says, that rock-weed is a distinctive species of sea-weed abundant on our eastern coast—only valuable as a fertilizer for the salt which it contains.

It contains a much larger proportion of ash than any land plant, this ash being rich in alkali salts, including phosphate of lime. In fact, the ash of all sea-weeds contains all the substances taken from the soil by our usual farm crops, and from this fact they may be regarded as a general fertilizer of considerable value.

As regards nitrogen, they contain, on an average, an amount equal to that of ordinary farm manure.

Yet, notwithstanding these facts, the results of the practical use of rock-weed are quite variable, depending somewhat upon the conditions under which they are used.

It undergoes rapid decomposition, and if left in heaps in a fresh state, diminishes bulk wonderfully. Composted with farm manure, it assists in its decomposition, and greatly improves its quality. As a top dressing for grass lands, as a mulch for fruit trees, or plowed under in a green state, its results are generally very satisfactory.

The salt contained in the rock-weed is not without some value it is true; but it was this alone for which it was used, the sea-weed would be the most expensive and cumbersome mode in which it could be applied—since a half a bushel of salt would supply the place of a ton of sea-weed.

It has undoubtedly manural value for the nitrogenous compounds, and the phosphate of lime which it contains.

Will not our friends in other towns and districts favor us with wheat and corn returns of the present season's harvest?

Sent in the Wheat Reports.

In another place will be found a wheat report from a single school district in Aroostook county, which returns a yield of six hundred and eighteen bushels, (and this too in a year unfavorable for the best results—on account of the dry season,) giving an average of forty-four and one-seventh bushels to each of the fourteen families residing in the district, or as our correspondent says, **TWO BARRELS OF FLOUR TO EACH PERSON** in these families. What do our New England farmers and western editorial brethren say now about Maine farming, and the ability of our own State to raise her own wheat and flour on her own soil? And although as yet but few districts have been heard from; they indicate something of the grand results of the wheat harvest in Maine this season, when all the towns and all the school districts shall have been heard from. Aroostook county alone, when all its fertile soil is brought under cultivation, is capable of yielding all the wheat and flour needed for consumption by the people of Maine. Then go out of Maine, young man, to engage in farming, to raise big crops, to make a home, or to get independent! Aroostook county will welcome you, and its rewards of industry far outweigh the rewards of the uncertain and far off West.

And not in Aroostook alone have good and heavy crops of wheat been harvested this year. In all the older sections, as we have abundant evidence in private letters, articles of correspondents and statements of farmers, that the yield of wheat (and corn too) has been greater than in any year before for a period of ten, and some say twenty years. How must this lessen the amount of cash paid out for foreign flour, and contribute to the solid INDEPENDENCE AND PROSPERITY of our working, faithful farmers!

Mr. Ira D. Sturgis of this city, who has large land and timber interests in the Dead River valley, informs us that in that splendid section of Maine, over four thousand bushels of wheat will be raised this year, and more than twenty-five hundred bushels will be ground at a single mill at Flagstaff settlement!

The rich interval and upland farms of the Dead River valley yield abundantly of grass, oats, wheat and cattle, (the corner stones of good farming,) and that part of Maine, like the Ossipee Angling Association in 1869, he fitted up a public house to accommodate some thirty or forty guests, and built what is known as the "big barn" on the outlet of Haley pond, which is directly north of the city. Mr. Burke, soon after his settlement in the place started in trade, and is still in business, even since his death.

At the time of the organization of the Ossipee Angling Association in 1869, he fitted up a public house to accommodate some thirty or forty guests, and built what is known as the "big barn" on the outlet of Haley pond, which is directly north of the city. Mr. Burke, soon after his settlement in the place started in trade, and is still in business, even since his death.

Let us see; ten bushels of grain at seventy cents per bushel, would come to seven dollars.

The invested in phosphate at two

dollars per bushel, would have bought tea

or coffee at twice the price.

Let us see; ten bushels of grain at seventy cents per bushel, would come to seven dollars.

The invested in phosphate at two

dollars per bushel, would have bought tea

or coffee at twice the price.

Let us see; ten bushels of grain at seventy cents per bushel, would come to seven dollars.

The invested in phosphate at two

dollars per bushel, would have bought tea

or coffee at twice the price.

Let us see; ten bushels of grain at seventy cents per bushel, would come to seven dollars.

The invested in phosphate at two

dollars per bushel, would have bought tea

or coffee at twice the price.

Let us see; ten bushels of grain at seventy cents per bushel, would come to seven dollars.

The invested in phosphate at two

dollars per bushel, would have bought tea

or coffee at twice the price.

Let us see; ten bushels of grain at seventy cents per bushel, would come to seven dollars.

The invested in phosphate at two

dollars per bushel, would have bought tea

or coffee at twice the price.

Let us see; ten bushels of grain at seventy cents per bushel, would come to seven dollars.

The invested in phosphate at two

dollars per bushel, would have bought tea

or coffee at twice the price.

Let us see; ten bushels of grain at seventy cents per bushel, would come to seven dollars.

The invested in phosphate at two

dollars per bushel, would have bought tea

or coffee at twice the price.

Let us see; ten bushels of grain at seventy cents per bushel, would come to seven dollars.

The invested in phosphate at two

dollars per bushel, would have bought tea

or coffee at twice the price.

Let us see; ten bushels of grain at seventy cents per bushel, would come to seven dollars.

The invested in phosphate at two

dollars per bushel, would have bought tea

or coffee at twice the price.

Let us see; ten bushels of grain at seventy cents per bushel, would come to seven dollars.

The invested in phosphate at two

dollars per bushel, would have bought tea

or coffee at twice the price.

Let us see; ten bushels of grain at seventy cents per bushel, would come to seven dollars.

The invested in phosphate at two

dollars per bushel, would have bought tea

or coffee at twice the price.

Let us see; ten bushels of grain at seventy cents per bushel, would come to seven dollars.

The invested in phosphate at two

dollars per bushel, would have bought tea

or coffee at twice the price.

Let us see; ten bushels of grain at seventy cents per bushel, would come to seven dollars.

The invested in phosphate at two

dollars per bushel, would have bought tea

or coffee at twice the price.

Let us see; ten bushels of grain at seventy cents per bushel, would come to seven dollars.

The invested in phosphate at two

dollars per bushel, would have bought tea

or coffee at twice the price.

Let us see; ten bushels of grain at seventy cents per bushel, would come to seven dollars.

The invested in phosphate at two

dollars per bushel, would have bought tea

or coffee at twice the price.

Let us see; ten bushels of grain at seventy cents per bushel, would come to seven dollars.

The invested in phosphate at two

dollars per bushel, would have bought tea

or coffee at twice the price.

Let us see; ten bushels of grain at seventy cents per bushel, would come to seven dollars.

The invested in phosphate at two

dollars per bushel, would have bought tea

or coffee at twice the price.

Let us see; ten bushels of grain at seventy cents per bushel, would come to seven dollars.

The invested in phosphate at two

dollars per bushel, would have bought tea

or coffee at twice the price.

Let us see; ten bushels of grain at seventy cents per bushel, would come to seven dollars.

The invested in phosphate at two

dollars per bushel, would have bought tea

or coffee at twice the price.

Let us see; ten bushels of grain at seventy cents per bushel, would come to seven dollars.

The invested in phosphate at two

dollars per bushel, would have bought tea

or coffee at twice the price.

Let us see; ten bushels of grain at seventy cents per bushel, would come to seven dollars.

The invested in phosphate at two

dollars per bushel, would have bought tea

or coffee at twice the price.

Let us see; ten bushels of grain at seventy cents per bushel, would come to seven dollars.

The invested in phosphate at two

dollars per bushel, would have bought tea

or coffee at twice the price.

Let us see; ten bushels of grain at seventy cents per bushel, would come to seven dollars.

The invested in phosphate at two

dollars per bushel, would have bought tea

or coffee at twice the price.

Let us see; ten bushels of grain at seventy cents per bushel, would come to seven dollars.

The invested in phosphate at two

dollars per bushel, would have bought tea

or coffee at twice the price.

Let us see; ten bushels of grain at seventy cents per bushel, would come to seven dollars.

The invested in phosphate at two

dollars per bushel, would have bought tea

or coffee at twice the price.

Let us see; ten bushels of grain at seventy cents per bushel, would come to seven dollars.

The invested in phosphate at two

dollars per bushel, would have bought tea

or coffee at twice the price.

Let us see; ten bushels of grain at seventy cents per bushel, would come to seven dollars.

The

The Maine Farmer: An Agricultural and Family Newspaper.

Maine Farmer.

Augusta, December 8, 1877.

TERMS OF THE MAINE FARMER.
\$2.00 in ADVANCE, OR \$1.50 IF PAID WITHIN
THREE MONTHS OF DATE RECEIVED.

Postage Free to all Subscribers.

All payments made by subscribers will be creditable upon their bills, attached to their papers, the printed date in connection with the subscriber's name will show the time to which he has paid, and will constitute, in all cases, a valid receipt for money paid by him.

For any change to be made in his post-office address or to discontinue his paper, must communicate to us the name of the office to which it has previously been sent; otherwise we shall be unable to comply with his request.

Collectors' Notices.

Mr. C. S. AYER will call upon our subscribers in Sagadahoc county during the month of December. Mr. S. A. TALBOT will call upon our subscribers in Washington county in December.

Mr. J. P. CLARK will call upon subscribers in Eastonham and Piscataquis during November and December.

Christmas is Coming!

The season of good wishes and good cheer, when everybody is expected to feel like doing something in a spirit of love and good will for friends and neighbors, is approaching. We trust the kindly influences of this season will not be lost upon the patrons of the *MAINE FARMER*, and that many of them—especially those in arrears—will remember their old friends and constant weekly visitor, not only with good wishes, but with substantial tokens of good will, by remitting to the publishers on CHRISTMAS WEEK, the amount, or some portion of the amount due for the paper. It will no doubt be to them a pleasure as well as a duty to act upon this suggestion, and we hope fully the result will gladden our hearts, and enable us thankfully to enjoy what we heartily wish to all our subscribers and readers.

A MERRY CHRISTMAS!

The Fishery Award.

We had indulged the hope that the vexing fishery question between the United States and the Maritime Provinces, in which Maine has so large an interest, was forever settled by the treaty of 1872, but this evidently is not to be the case. The award of the Commissioners is of so remarkable a character that the whole question must be reopened at the expiration of twelve years from 1872, and settled if at all, in some other way. By the terms of that treaty the privilege was granted to the United States by Great Britain, to take fish within British jurisdiction, that is, within three miles of the shore. For this privilege, the United States gave first a slight right on the coast of the United States and second, abolished the duty on fish imported from the Provinces. It was generally believed that the United States gave more than an equivalent for what was received, and it was stated at the time that the duties remitted by the treaty would amount to more than the value of the fish taken by citizens in Canadian waters. But this was not all. Great Britain demanded a certain sum in cash over and above the concessions offered by the United States, and in the blaze of glory and fraternity in which the treaty was negotiated, Uncle Sam offered a million of dollars which offer was declined. Arbitration to fix the amount to be paid was then suggested and the United States agreed to it. One of the commission was to be selected by Canada, one by the United States, and these two were to name the third. This commission, as stated last week, awarded the Dominion of Canada the large sum of \$5,500,000. The report was signed only by two of the board, the American commissioner dissenting from the decision of the majority.

The other right granted by this treaty on the part of Great Britain, was to fish within or immediately off the coast, or river, for the commission unanimously decided that the right to buy bait and supplies was not enough, and was not to be considered unless computing the sum to be paid by the United States. If considered at all, it should, of course, have been regarded as a mutual transaction by which buyer and seller were equally benefited. Before the above treaty was negotiated, American vessels fished within the limits conceded, under a license from the Canadian government, and the price per year fixed for such license, was fifty cents per ton for all vessels engaged. This was all that was asked and was doubtless a fair price. Now the American fisherman engaged in the gulf fishery does not come up to forty thousand tons, and if it did, the sum required to be paid for the same privilege which is enjoyed under the treaty, would amount to only \$30,000 yearly, or in twelve years at five per cent interest, to the sum of \$330,000, in round numbers. Mr. Foster, the counsel for the United States before the Commission, showed that in 1873 about 91,000 barrels of British catch were imported into the United States on the duty paid by the United States, and the amount of \$182,000, or more than nine times the amount of the license paid by Americans for the right to fish in Canadian waters.

All this goes to show the absurdity of the claims and the injustice of the award, but it is useless to complain. The suggestion has been made that, as the language of the award did not specify a majority report, anything short of a unanimous report is not binding. This is a mere quibble and we trust it will not be raised. The agreement to arbitrate was deliberately made and not to abide by the decision is dishonorable, whether unjust or not. Besides it will enable us to settle the troublesome question of the disposal of the balance of the Geneva award. Congress has been very much exercised over this problem which can now be solved at once.

The entire right granted by this treaty on the part of Great Britain, was to fish within or immediately off the coast, or river, for the commission unanimously decided that the right to buy bait and supplies was not enough, and was not to be considered unless computing the sum to be paid by the United States.

If considered at all, it should, of course, have been regarded as a mutual transaction by which buyer and seller were equally benefited. Before the above treaty was negotiated, American vessels fished within the limits conceded, under a license from the Canadian government, and the price per year fixed for such license, was fifty cents per ton for all vessels engaged.

This was all that was asked and was doubtless a fair price. Now the American fisherman engaged in the gulf fishery does not come up to forty thousand tons, and if it did, the sum required to be paid for the same privilege which is enjoyed under the treaty, would amount to only \$30,000 yearly, or in twelve years at five per cent interest, to the sum of \$330,000, in round numbers.

Mr. Foster, the counsel for the United States before the Commission, showed that in 1873 about 91,000 barrels of British catch were imported into the United States on the duty paid by the United States, and the amount of \$182,000, or more than nine times the amount of the license paid by Americans for the right to fish in Canadian waters.

All this goes to show the absurdity of the claims and the injustice of the award, but it is useless to complain. The suggestion has been made that, as the language of the award did not specify a majority report, anything short of a unanimous report is not binding. This is a mere quibble and we trust it will not be raised. The agreement to arbitrate was deliberately made and not to abide by the decision is dishonorable, whether unjust or not. Besides it will enable us to settle the troublesome question of the disposal of the balance of the Geneva award. Congress has been very much exercised over this problem which can now be solved at once.

The entire right granted by this treaty on the part of Great Britain, was to fish within or immediately off the coast, or river, for the commission unanimously decided that the right to buy bait and supplies was not enough, and was not to be considered unless computing the sum to be paid by the United States.

If considered at all, it should, of course, have been regarded as a mutual transaction by which buyer and seller were equally benefited. Before the above treaty was negotiated, American vessels fished within the limits conceded, under a license from the Canadian government, and the price per year fixed for such license, was fifty cents per ton for all vessels engaged.

This was all that was asked and was doubtless a fair price. Now the American fisherman engaged in the gulf fishery does not come up to forty thousand tons, and if it did, the sum required to be paid for the same privilege which is enjoyed under the treaty, would amount to only \$30,000 yearly, or in twelve years at five per cent interest, to the sum of \$330,000, in round numbers.

Mr. Foster, the counsel for the United States before the Commission, showed that in 1873 about 91,000 barrels of British catch were imported into the United States on the duty paid by the United States, and the amount of \$182,000, or more than nine times the amount of the license paid by Americans for the right to fish in Canadian waters.

All this goes to show the absurdity of the claims and the injustice of the award, but it is useless to complain. The suggestion has been made that, as the language of the award did not specify a majority report, anything short of a unanimous report is not binding. This is a mere quibble and we trust it will not be raised. The agreement to arbitrate was deliberately made and not to abide by the decision is dishonorable, whether unjust or not. Besides it will enable us to settle the troublesome question of the disposal of the balance of the Geneva award. Congress has been very much exercised over this problem which can now be solved at once.

The entire right granted by this treaty on the part of Great Britain, was to fish within or immediately off the coast, or river, for the commission unanimously decided that the right to buy bait and supplies was not enough, and was not to be considered unless computing the sum to be paid by the United States.

If considered at all, it should, of course, have been regarded as a mutual transaction by which buyer and seller were equally benefited. Before the above treaty was negotiated, American vessels fished within the limits conceded, under a license from the Canadian government, and the price per year fixed for such license, was fifty cents per ton for all vessels engaged.

This was all that was asked and was doubtless a fair price. Now the American fisherman engaged in the gulf fishery does not come up to forty thousand tons, and if it did, the sum required to be paid for the same privilege which is enjoyed under the treaty, would amount to only \$30,000 yearly, or in twelve years at five per cent interest, to the sum of \$330,000, in round numbers.

Mr. Foster, the counsel for the United States before the Commission, showed that in 1873 about 91,000 barrels of British catch were imported into the United States on the duty paid by the United States, and the amount of \$182,000, or more than nine times the amount of the license paid by Americans for the right to fish in Canadian waters.

All this goes to show the absurdity of the claims and the injustice of the award, but it is useless to complain. The suggestion has been made that, as the language of the award did not specify a majority report, anything short of a unanimous report is not binding. This is a mere quibble and we trust it will not be raised. The agreement to arbitrate was deliberately made and not to abide by the decision is dishonorable, whether unjust or not. Besides it will enable us to settle the troublesome question of the disposal of the balance of the Geneva award. Congress has been very much exercised over this problem which can now be solved at once.

The entire right granted by this treaty on the part of Great Britain, was to fish within or immediately off the coast, or river, for the commission unanimously decided that the right to buy bait and supplies was not enough, and was not to be considered unless computing the sum to be paid by the United States.

If considered at all, it should, of course, have been regarded as a mutual transaction by which buyer and seller were equally benefited. Before the above treaty was negotiated, American vessels fished within the limits conceded, under a license from the Canadian government, and the price per year fixed for such license, was fifty cents per ton for all vessels engaged.

This was all that was asked and was doubtless a fair price. Now the American fisherman engaged in the gulf fishery does not come up to forty thousand tons, and if it did, the sum required to be paid for the same privilege which is enjoyed under the treaty, would amount to only \$30,000 yearly, or in twelve years at five per cent interest, to the sum of \$330,000, in round numbers.

Mr. Foster, the counsel for the United States before the Commission, showed that in 1873 about 91,000 barrels of British catch were imported into the United States on the duty paid by the United States, and the amount of \$182,000, or more than nine times the amount of the license paid by Americans for the right to fish in Canadian waters.

All this goes to show the absurdity of the claims and the injustice of the award, but it is useless to complain. The suggestion has been made that, as the language of the award did not specify a majority report, anything short of a unanimous report is not binding. This is a mere quibble and we trust it will not be raised. The agreement to arbitrate was deliberately made and not to abide by the decision is dishonorable, whether unjust or not. Besides it will enable us to settle the troublesome question of the disposal of the balance of the Geneva award. Congress has been very much exercised over this problem which can now be solved at once.

The entire right granted by this treaty on the part of Great Britain, was to fish within or immediately off the coast, or river, for the commission unanimously decided that the right to buy bait and supplies was not enough, and was not to be considered unless computing the sum to be paid by the United States.

If considered at all, it should, of course, have been regarded as a mutual transaction by which buyer and seller were equally benefited. Before the above treaty was negotiated, American vessels fished within the limits conceded, under a license from the Canadian government, and the price per year fixed for such license, was fifty cents per ton for all vessels engaged.

This was all that was asked and was doubtless a fair price. Now the American fisherman engaged in the gulf fishery does not come up to forty thousand tons, and if it did, the sum required to be paid for the same privilege which is enjoyed under the treaty, would amount to only \$30,000 yearly, or in twelve years at five per cent interest, to the sum of \$330,000, in round numbers.

Mr. Foster, the counsel for the United States before the Commission, showed that in 1873 about 91,000 barrels of British catch were imported into the United States on the duty paid by the United States, and the amount of \$182,000, or more than nine times the amount of the license paid by Americans for the right to fish in Canadian waters.

All this goes to show the absurdity of the claims and the injustice of the award, but it is useless to complain. The suggestion has been made that, as the language of the award did not specify a majority report, anything short of a unanimous report is not binding. This is a mere quibble and we trust it will not be raised. The agreement to arbitrate was deliberately made and not to abide by the decision is dishonorable, whether unjust or not. Besides it will enable us to settle the troublesome question of the disposal of the balance of the Geneva award. Congress has been very much exercised over this problem which can now be solved at once.

The entire right granted by this treaty on the part of Great Britain, was to fish within or immediately off the coast, or river, for the commission unanimously decided that the right to buy bait and supplies was not enough, and was not to be considered unless computing the sum to be paid by the United States.

If considered at all, it should, of course, have been regarded as a mutual transaction by which buyer and seller were equally benefited. Before the above treaty was negotiated, American vessels fished within the limits conceded, under a license from the Canadian government, and the price per year fixed for such license, was fifty cents per ton for all vessels engaged.

This was all that was asked and was doubtless a fair price. Now the American fisherman engaged in the gulf fishery does not come up to forty thousand tons, and if it did, the sum required to be paid for the same privilege which is enjoyed under the treaty, would amount to only \$30,000 yearly, or in twelve years at five per cent interest, to the sum of \$330,000, in round numbers.

Mr. Foster, the counsel for the United States before the Commission, showed that in 1873 about 91,000 barrels of British catch were imported into the United States on the duty paid by the United States, and the amount of \$182,000, or more than nine times the amount of the license paid by Americans for the right to fish in Canadian waters.

All this goes to show the absurdity of the claims and the injustice of the award, but it is useless to complain. The suggestion has been made that, as the language of the award did not specify a majority report, anything short of a unanimous report is not binding. This is a mere quibble and we trust it will not be raised. The agreement to arbitrate was deliberately made and not to abide by the decision is dishonorable, whether unjust or not. Besides it will enable us to settle the troublesome question of the disposal of the balance of the Geneva award. Congress has been very much exercised over this problem which can now be solved at once.

The entire right granted by this treaty on the part of Great Britain, was to fish within or immediately off the coast, or river, for the commission unanimously decided that the right to buy bait and supplies was not enough, and was not to be considered unless computing the sum to be paid by the United States.

If considered at all, it should, of course, have been regarded as a mutual transaction by which buyer and seller were equally benefited. Before the above treaty was negotiated, American vessels fished within the limits conceded, under a license from the Canadian government, and the price per year fixed for such license, was fifty cents per ton for all vessels engaged.

This was all that was asked and was doubtless a fair price. Now the American fisherman engaged in the gulf fishery does not come up to forty thousand tons, and if it did, the sum required to be paid for the same privilege which is enjoyed under the treaty, would amount to only \$30,000 yearly, or in twelve years at five per cent interest, to the sum of \$330,000, in round numbers.

Mr. Foster, the counsel for the United States before the Commission, showed that in 1873 about 91,000 barrels of British catch were imported into the United States on the duty paid by the United States, and the amount of \$182,000, or more than nine times the amount of the license paid by Americans for the right to fish in Canadian waters.

All this goes to show the absurdity of the claims and the injustice of the award, but it is useless to complain. The suggestion has been made that, as the language of the award did not specify a majority report, anything short of a unanimous report is not binding. This is a mere quibble and we trust it will not be raised. The agreement to arbitrate was deliberately made and not to abide by the decision is dishonorable, whether unjust or not. Besides it will enable us to settle the troublesome question of the disposal of the balance of the Geneva award. Congress has been very much exercised over this problem which can now be solved at once.

The entire right granted by this treaty on the part of Great Britain, was to fish within or immediately off the coast, or river, for the commission unanimously decided that the right to buy bait and supplies was not enough, and was not to be considered unless computing the sum to be paid by the United States.

If considered at all, it should, of course, have been regarded as a mutual transaction by which buyer and seller were equally benefited. Before the above treaty was negotiated, American vessels fished within the limits conceded, under a license from the Canadian government, and the price per year fixed for such license, was fifty cents per ton for all vessels engaged.

This was all that was asked and was doubtless a fair price. Now the American fisherman engaged in the gulf fishery does not come up to forty thousand tons, and if it did, the sum required to be paid for the same privilege which is enjoyed under the treaty, would amount to only \$30,000 yearly, or in twelve years at five per cent interest, to the sum of \$330,000, in round numbers.

Mr. Foster, the counsel for the United States before the Commission, showed that in 1873 about 91,000 barrels of British catch were imported into the United States on the duty paid by the United States, and the amount of \$182,000, or more than nine times the amount of the license paid by Americans for the right to fish in Canadian waters.

All this goes to show the absurdity of the claims and the injustice of the award, but it is useless to complain. The suggestion has been made that, as the language of the award did not specify a majority report, anything short of a unanimous report is not binding. This is a mere quibble and we trust it will not be raised. The agreement to arbitrate was deliberately made and not to abide by the decision is dishonorable, whether unjust or not. Besides it will enable us to settle the troublesome question of the disposal of the balance of the Geneva award. Congress has been very much exercised over this problem which can now be solved at once.

The entire right granted by this treaty on the part of Great Britain, was to fish within or immediately off the coast, or river, for the commission unanimously decided that the right to buy bait and supplies was not enough, and was not to be considered unless computing the sum to be paid by the United States.

If considered at all, it should, of course, have been regarded as a mutual transaction by which buyer and seller were equally benefited. Before the above treaty was negotiated, American vessels fished within the limits conceded, under a license from the Canadian government, and the price per year fixed for such license, was fifty cents per ton for all vessels engaged.

This was all that was asked and was doubtless a fair price. Now the American fisherman engaged in the gulf fishery does not come up to forty thousand tons, and if it did, the sum required to be paid for the same privilege which is enjoyed under the treaty, would amount to only \$30,000 yearly, or in twelve years at five per cent interest, to the sum of \$330,000, in round numbers.

Mr. Foster, the counsel for the United States before the Commission, showed that in 1873 about 91,000 barrels of British catch were imported into the United States on the duty paid by the United States, and the amount of \$182,000, or more than nine times the amount of the license paid by Americans for the right to fish in Canadian waters.

All this goes to show the absurdity of the claims and the injustice of the award, but it is useless to complain. The suggestion has been made that, as the language of the award did not specify a majority report, anything short of a unanimous report is not binding. This is a mere quibble and we trust it will not be raised. The agreement to arbitrate was deliberately made and not to abide by the decision is dishonorable, whether unjust or not. Besides it will enable us to settle the troublesome question of the disposal of the balance of the Geneva award. Congress has been very much exercised over this problem which can now be solved at once.

The entire right granted by this treaty on the part of Great Britain, was to fish within or immediately off the coast, or river, for the commission unanimously decided that the right to buy bait and supplies was not enough, and was not to be considered unless computing the sum to be paid by the United States.

If considered at all, it should, of course, have been regarded as a mutual transaction by which buyer and seller were equally benefited. Before the above treaty was negotiated, American vessels fished within the limits conceded, under a license from the Canadian government, and the price per year fixed for such license, was fifty cents per ton for all vessels engaged.

This was all that was asked and was doubtless a fair price. Now the American fisherman engaged in the gulf fishery does not come up to forty thousand tons, and if it did, the sum required to be paid for the same privilege which is enjoyed under the treaty, would amount to only \$30,000 yearly, or in twelve years at five per cent interest, to the sum of \$330,000, in round numbers.

Mr. Foster, the counsel for the United States before the Commission, showed that in 1873 about 91,000 barrels of British catch were imported into the United States on the duty paid by the United States, and the amount of \$182,000, or more than nine times the amount of the license paid by Americans for the right to fish in Canadian waters.

All this goes to show the absurdity of the claims and the injustice of the award, but it is useless

